



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,500	06/30/2004	Jack Brass	213899.00020	4471

27160 7590 06/13/2006

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP  
525 WEST MONROE STREET  
CHICAGO, IL 60661-3693

EXAMINER

LEE, GUIYOUNG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2875

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/500,500	Applicant(s) BRASS ET AL.	
	Examiner Guiyoung Lee	Art Unit 2875	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 116-132 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 116-132 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Prelim./Amdt.*

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the amendment filed 04/04/2006.
2. Claims 116-132 are pending, and claims 1-115 have been cancelled.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 126 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sommers et al. (US 6,485,160 B1).
5. Re claim 126: Sommers discloses an inspection lamp having a plurality of LEDs, a plurality of lenses, a handle section, a head section having an opening, a battery wherein the head section and handle section are connected physically, and beams from the LEDs are superimposed each other at a target distance.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2875

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 116-118, 121-125, 127-130 and 132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sommers in view of Mass et al. (US 6,402,347 B1).

Re claims 116-118, 121-125, 127-130 and 132: Sommers' teachings have been discussed above. Further, examiner regards 30a in Fig.1 in Sommers reference as a baffle including a spacer and a separator, and Sommers suggests a "honeycomb" array pattern for the lens mount and the LEDs, which could be used as a baffle or a separator. Sommers does not teach the lens mount and lenses are formed integrally as a single piece of plastic. However, Mass et al. discloses a plurality of LEDs and a plurality of lenses are formed as a single piece of plastic (See 6 Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sommers' lenses and lens mount being integrated in a single piece of plastic as taught by Mass in order to simplify the construction of lens and lens mount. With regard to the claimed limitation that the beams from the plurality of LEDs are superimposed at a distance equal to or greater than 6 inches or equal to or greater than 20 inches, Sommers does not teach the distance as set forth in the claim. However, Sommers suggests many different types of lenses such as multiple refractive/diffractive hybrid lenses or Fresnel lenses which has different focal points. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the superimposing distance of the plurality of beams as set forth in the claims by substituting Sommers' lens with the different types of lenses because the selection of any of these known equivalents in order to adjust the superimposing distance of the plurality of beams would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claim 131 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: With regard to claim 131 the prior art of record fails to disclose the claimed limitation that each of one or more of LEDs is offset from an optical center of its associated lens to cause the radiation passing through the lenses to be substantially superimposed to a target area at the target distance.

***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Guiyoung Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-2374. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 571-272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2875

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LGY



Sandra O'Shea  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800